

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re: Application of:	:	
Brown et al.	:	
Serial No: 09/998,386	:	Before the Examiner:
		Maikhahan Nguyen
Filed: 11/15/2001	:	Group Art Unit: 2176
Title: APPARATUS AND METHOD	:	Confirmation No.: 7328
OF HIGHLIGHTING LINKS IN A WEB	:	
PAGE	:	

**RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

In an Office Action dated October 17, 2007, the Office included a NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF because in the Brief filed on July 03, 2007, Appellants separately argued the patentability of dependent Claims 9, 20, 31 and 42; however, Appellants only mapped the limitations recited in independent claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 45 to the specification. According to Examiner Nguyen, on a telephone call with Appellants' attorney, the limitations of the dependent claims, whose patentability was argued, are also supposed to be mapped to the specification in order for the Brief to fall within 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(v). Appellants respectfully disagree.

37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(v) requires that "every means plus function" and "step plus function" of each independent claim involved in the Appeal and of each dependent claim argued separately be identified.

AUS920010875US1

Appl. No. 09/998,386

Response to Notification of Non-Compliant brief dated 11/16/2007

Reply to Office Action of 10/17/2007

The dependent claims, which were argued separately, do not contain “means plus functions” or “step plus functions.” Consequently, their limitations need not be identified. Therefore, the Brief is within 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(v).

Respectfully Submitted

By:

Volet Emile  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 39,969  
(512) 306-7969

AUS920010875US1